

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 731

SP 012 455

AUTHOR Evans, Robert L.; And Others
TITLE Responsive Teacher Inservice Needs Assessment in an Urban Setting.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Convention (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Class Management; Curriculum Planning; Individualized Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Improvement; *Needs Assessment; *Program Planning; Prosocial Behavior; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS Syracuse Urban Teaching Center

ABSTRACT

Research literature supports the contention that teachers should be involved in program design, implementation, and evaluation of inservice education programs. This study was an attempt to gain information concerning the self-perceived inservice needs of teachers in an urban setting. Six areas of need were identified: (1) developing pupil interpersonal skills; (2) implementing instruction; (3) planning instruction; (4) classroom management; (5) individualizing instruction; and (6) diagnosing student needs. Additionally, it was found that number of years teaching, teaching degree held, and teacher perception of student socioeconomic status were related to the importance teachers attached to these areas. Results of this study support the notion that program developers should take into account the differentiated inservice needs of teachers. (Authors/JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED152731

APR 17 8 14 AM '78

RESPONSIVE TEACHER INSERVICE NEEDS ASSESSMENT
IN AN URBAN SETTING

ROBERT L. EVANS
DAVID M. BYRD
TERRY M. COLEMAN

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE
AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
ANNUAL CONVENTION

TORONTO

MARCH 1978

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert L. Evans

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP012 455

The Syracuse Urban Teaching Center (S.U.T.C.) was involved in an intensive investigation of the inservice needs of its teachers during the Spring semester of the 1977 academic year. As one aspect of this investigation, a teacher inservice needs assessment was undertaken.

S.U.T.C. is a collaborative arrangement between Syracuse University and the Syracuse City School District. Its governance board is made up of university faculty and administrators, school district faculty and administrators and an equal representation of community members. Operating out of the governing body is a Program Development committee. This committee has responsibility for inservice education within the Center. At the time of this study, SUTC was an association of six K-6 elementary schools within the Syracuse City School District. Due to consolidation within the school district, S.U.T.C. now functions in five K-6 schools.

This inservice investigation was an attempt to assess teachers' perceived needs for inservice training in selected skill development areas. Since one of the primary functions of S.U.T.C. has been to provide continuous responsive inservice program development, this type of needs assessment was conducted in order to ascertain teacher perceived need for inservice training in selective skill development areas.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were:

1. To provide information concerning the nature and extent of teacher perceived inservice needs in an urban setting.
2. To provide information on what teacher characteristics might be used as predictors of inservice needs in an urban setting.
3. To provide additional information into differentiated inservice needs.

4. To provide information that might help program developers plan and initiate inservice programs in the future.
5. To provide a foundation from which further research into the area of teacher inservice needs can be accomplished.

Theoretical Framework

Inservice education, what is it and what should it become? Ken Howey has described it as "a multifaced if not many splendored enterprise."¹ Louis Rubin goes one step further, for he finds it "virtually a lost cause."² As Rubin points out, teacher professional growth has not been taken seriously; moreover, it has lacked a realistic methodology. He laments the astonishing clumsiness with which inservice has been managed and is convinced it is directly related to the cavalier manner with which it has been treated.

In reviewing the literature on inservice education, three major topics seem to be paramount to an understanding of current inservice practices and future inservice success. They are:

1. A definition of inservice education.
2. The theoretical and conceptual background involved in inservice education.
3. Research into effective inservice education.

A single definition of inservice education is at this time not a reality. Various definitions have been presented, each with its own view of teaching.

Traditionally, there have been three interest groups whose concerns have included teachers' professional growth. The first group, institutions of higher education and their faculty, have customarily

been the trainers of and curriculum developers for teacher education, both pre- and inservice. Morris L. Cogan gave a definition that fits nicely with the traditional role of university faculty. He stated, "Inservice education of teachers is commonly understood to include the collegiate and school-based programs of professional study and work in which the teacher is involved after he (sic) has been certified and employed."³

The second major group, made up of school districts and their administrators, traditionally controls funding and therefore implementation of inservice programs. A definition that fits this second group's role was written in 1966 by the NEA. "The term inservice education is used by educators to denote efforts of administrative and supervisory officials to promote by appropriate means the professional growth and development of educational personnel."⁴

The third group involved in teacher professional growth is, of course, teachers and teachers' organizations whose role has been receiving and implementing inservice programs. Teachers, perhaps, would lean toward a more recent NEA definition of inservice education written in 1975, which stated: "Inservice education of teachers (or staff development, continuing education, professional development) is defined as any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other teachers after receiving her or his initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice."⁵ The very fact that two definitions of inservice education, written nine years apart by the same organization, can be used to state

the role of two groups (school districts and teachers) only enhances a better understanding of the changes that inservice education has faced in the last ten years.

The theoretical and conceptual literature on inservice education is the next major section of this review. Its inclusion is based on its fertile, thought-provoking nature. It is of value in the development of inservice programs and as a conceptual springboard for future research into the field of inservice education. In short, this section talks to the present state of inservice education and its future direction.

Two areas that seem to hold signs of being worthy for future consideration and scrutiny are self-directed, responsive inservice programming (inservice programs in which the client has influence as to program topics and goals) and collaboration between educational interest groups (e.g., higher education; teachers and administrators) in the development, implementation and evaluation of inservice programs.

Roy Edelfelt talks to the issue of responsive, self-directed inservice; he believes "the most important element in continuing education is what the individual does for his own self-improvement One of the main criteria for adequacy . . . of a teacher education program should be whether it trains people to be self-educative." He also points out that "although continuing education must insure minimum standards, it must also encourage individuality and uniqueness. It will take all kinds of people to make a school like the real world."⁶

Robert Bush follows closely on this theme of responsive, self-directed inservice. He asserts that "for the reform of teacher inservice education . . . my prescription is simple: treat the teacher as a professionally competent person."⁷

John Mangiani and David McWilliams concur with these earlier reflections on inservice education. They believe "the success of any inservice program depends upon the commitment of the district's staff to the goals and objectives of that program. This commitment is to a very large degree contingent upon the amount of staff involvement prevalent in the planning stages of the program."⁸

Elizabeth Dillon reinforces previous statements with her own reflections on the state of inservice education today and a possible future inservice thrust. "Teachers are becoming more and more unwilling to accept staff development efforts which they have no part in planning and which are 'clapped on' them."⁹ She extends her belief with a call for collaboration.

There is a great potential in marshalling the forces available in the institution of higher education, the local school district administration, and the teacher organizations, to focus on worthwhile, results-oriented staff development efforts. But it will require a kind of parity which does not now exist, and it will require that members of the three organizations learn to operate in an atmosphere of greater openness and trust . . .

We in education can take the easy road continuing to apply a patch here and poultice there, to convince ourselves that we are doing something significant for students because our staff members are engaged in a flurry of professional growth activities from a variety of sources, or we can accept the more difficult task of disciplining ourselves and our organization to direct concentrated efforts toward areas of identified need.¹⁰

Collaboration--its call is prevalent through the literature of inservice education. The development of self-directed inservice education cannot be carried on in a vacuum and few of those involved in education would argue for control of all aspects of inservice to be based on teacher felt need. There is no doubt that there are also other responsible education interest groups each with its own traditional roles and responsibilities. Robert Howsam reminds us that education is best served by a collaboration of these interest groups. He bases his arguments for collaboration on a model which he feels contains the major interest groups, whose concerns include teacher education: the college or university, the teaching profession, the state and the community each with its own concerns and role to play in collaboration. Howsam states they "occupy the same life space and interest with each other; hence, the need to be responsive to each other."¹¹

Lillian Cady counsels that if there is to be a partnership in teacher education, a consortium, then,

. . . it must be pervasive. It must be more than shared management on a contractual agreement. It should signify a union, a fellowship wherein openness, trust and regard exist among partners. Each partner has equal voice in all phases of governance and program. Each partner bears responsibility and accountability Each partner's uniqueness, integrity, and separateness is recognized as essential to the existence and identity of the partnership.¹²

A major point involving collaboration is brought home by Bill Drummond and Anna Nuernberger. "Collaboration can occur when organizational leaders realize that their organizations cannot achieve important organizational goals alone or without the help and support of

others."¹³ The most important factor for successful collaboration is meaningful communication between the members of the various interest groups.

Drummond and Nuernberger suggest that collaboration requires:

1. some common goals, some payoff.
2. equitable power.
3. commitment to cooperation.
4. openness to the influence of others.
5. clear assignment of roles and responsibilities.
6. agreeable acceptance of assigned roles and responsibilities.
7. structure which provides participant freedom to make necessary day-to-day decisions to keep the project moving, to act independently.
8. more time, more money and/or the re-allocation of resources.
9. continuing innovation, stimulating enterprise to keep the venture from dying of boredom.¹⁴

Bruce Joyce¹⁵ and Ken Howey¹⁶ make an interesting point that inservice education must be looked at in relation to the total educational picture. Both feel that taking one aspect of inservice education and working on it alone is in Howey's words like "the arduous but futile exercise of pumping air into a tire full of holes."¹⁷ Howey and Joyce believe that our whole system of educating teachers must be studied if meaningful changes are to take place. Collaboration offers hope for such a total investigation of teacher education.

Research Review

Reviews into the state of the art of research into inservice edu-

cation show that hard evaluative research into effective inservice goals or formats is lacking. In an attempt to shed some additional light on the current state of research into inservice education and hopefully find future inservice research objectives, this literature has been reviewed.

The Research Division of the National Education Association¹⁸ reviewed the research into inservice education. Their report includes a definition of inservice education. In addition, various types of inservice are listed (e.g., classes and courses, workshops) as well as barriers to inservice education--time, cost, and the attitude of personnel toward inservice education (e.g., indifference, resistance, inertia). Several empirical studies are reviewed, findings included the increased opportunity now available for inservice education and professional growth activities, benefits accruing from inservice programming (e.g., faculty unity, improved teaching procedures) and problems (e.g., lack of time, lack of interest, lack of teacher stamina). An additional finding was the increased use of workshop formats for inservice development. There is no indication, however, of which inservice formats or methods are most successful. This review informs us that three trends do seem to appear. The first writings on inservice were largely opinion and recommendations on various inservice formats and problems, next came information on teacher needs and inservice offerings outside of the various content areas. The last major trend seems to be experimentation and evaluation of

inservice programs. This third trend is shown to be lacking at the time of this report.

Another research review of inservice education done by Dorothy Westby-Gibson¹⁹ uses a focus of the school as a social organization. The interaction between teacher, school, and community is investigated in terms of the process of change in schools. Some selected implications from this research are listed:

1. Schools must seek a high level of communication and understanding of their goals and practices if they are to have community support.
2. Teachers themselves should determine to a much greater extent their inservice needs.
 - a. Teachers should be encouraged to analyze their individual inservice requirements.
 - b. Teachers should be involved with administrators in planning inservice programs.
3. Teachers may be more likely to accept new practices if they see themselves as involved in a two-way process of aiding in hypothesis making and testing as well as receiving innovations.

Gordon Lawrence's²⁰ review of the inservice research is the most advanced source at this time. Lawrence outlines those common traits and patterns of successful inservice programs. Only studies dealing with the improvement of the competence of employed teachers were reviewed; in addition, all ninety-seven studies had some evaluation of their success. He found that inservice programs which have the greatest chance for success are those that involve teachers in the

planning, managing, and goal setting of individualized inservice programs. Programs which were incorporated into teacher classrooms and that received feedback were also among the most successful.

Lawrence's study begins to investigate this important area of successful inservice education. More scientifically advanced efforts can build upon this major review.

Through an examination of this current inservice education literature the Syracuse Urban Teaching Center (SUTC) decided that the involvement of teachers in the process of inservice education was a key factor in the success of inservice programs. As a first step into more complete involvement of teachers, a teacher inservice needs assessment was a suggested step. Current needs assessment instruments were therefore reviewed.

Several studies have been conducted which have attempted to identify areas of teacher perceived needs as they relate to inservice. In one of these studies, Donald Cruickshank, John Kennedy, and Betty Myers²¹ found that in relation to the areas of both "bothersomeness" and "frequency of problems," the factors of control (wanting students to behave as I want them to behave) and invigoration (wanting to vitalize my students' interest in learning and improving their achievement) to be significant factors.

Another critical study related to the assessment of teacher perceived needs for inservice was conducted by Gary Ingersoll.²² Using the Teacher Needs Assessment Survey, the teachers' responses were

subjected to a factor analysis yielding the following cluster areas as most important for an inservice program: Interpersonal communication and administration, developing pupil self, individualizing instruction, assessment, discipline, developing personal self, and classroom management.

Methods and Procedures

The Teacher Needs Assessment Survey, a forty item Likert scale type instrument, developed by Gary Ingersoll at Indiana University for the purpose of tapping teachers' self-perceived needs, was administered to one hundred nineteen teachers from the Syracuse Urban Teaching Center near the end of the Spring, 1977 semester. Respondents to the survey were asked to indicate their degree of agreement/disagreement with statements concerning the need for skill training in specific need areas. In addition, items dealing with various demographic data and one item dealing with teacher perception of the predominant socio-economic status of the students were administered. A copy of this instrument can be found in the Appendix of this paper. Items were coded such that a 5 indicated Strong Disagreement, whereas a 1 indicated Strong Agreement.

Results

Previous factor analysis of the Teacher Needs Assessment Survey had resulted in the identification of seven factors as reported above.²³ In order to provide a cross-validation of this factor structure with the population of the present study, a factor analysis of

the needs instrument was performed.

Principal component factor analysis of the instrument employing an orthogonal rotational method resulted in a six factor solution which together accounted for approximately 58% of the total common variance. Inspection of the loadings of each of the items in each of the six factors suggested the following interpretation:

Factor 1: Pupil Interpersonal Skills and Teacher Self-Involvement

Factor 2: Implementing Instruction

Factor 3: Instructional Planning

Factor 4: Classroom Management Skills

Factor 5: Individualizing Instruction

Factor 6: Diagnosing Student Needs

Table I displays those items whose factor loadings exceeded the criterion of .40 for each of the six factors.

The item clusterings, though paralleling in some respects the factor structure identified by Ingersoll, differed in some ways. Thus, the six factor solution identified by the present study was used in further analyses.

In order to get a sense for the relative emphases the overall group of respondents to the survey placed upon each of these six factor analytically derived need areas, mean scores were computed for each item whose factor loading was .40 or above. Table II displays these means.

TABLE I

Factor Loadings Exceeding .40

	Factor Loading
<u>Factor 1: Pupil Interpersonal Skills and Teacher Self-Improvement</u>	
35. Facilitating Pupil Social Interactions	.79
34. Facilitating Self-Confidence and Worth	.78
37. Stimulating Growth of Pupil Attitudes and Values	.71
31. Developing a Personal Self-Evaluation Method	.68
36. Facilitating Development of Pupil Responsibility	.66
13. Motivating Students to Learn on Their Own	.51
6. Involving Students in Self-Evaluation	.50
38. Instilling in the Student the Will to Learn on His/Her Own Initiative	.47
<u>Factor 2: Implementing Instruction</u>	
18. Utilization of Audio-Visual Equipment and Other Mechanical Aids	.73
29. Counselling and Conferring with Students	.61
21. Providing for Reinforcements	.59
12. Evaluating Instructional Design	.57
20. General Presentations of Information and Directions	.53
17. Using Questioning Procedures that Promote Discussion	.53
25. Knowing Where to Refer Student Problems Beyond What Can be Handled by the Teacher	.51
<u>Factor 3: Instructional Planning</u>	
9. Selecting and Specifying Performance Goals & Objectives	.80
8. Deciding What Teaching Technique is Best for a Particular Outcome	.75
5. Establishing Appropriate Performance Standards	.54
39. Developing or Modifying Instructional Procedures	.54
20. General Presentation of Information and Directions	.46
22. Deciding on Appropriate Student Grouping Procedures for Instruction	.44
<u>Factor 4: Classroom Management Skills</u>	
24. Managing Classroom Affairs in Order to Get Maximum Benefit from Supervising Aids, Tutors, etc.	.70
26. Useful Methods of Classroom Discipline & When to Use Them	.68
25. Knowing Where to Refer Student Problems Beyond What Can be Handled by the Teacher	.50
27. Mainstreaming Classroom Control Without Appearing as an Ogre to Students	.49

Factor
Loading

Factor 5: Individualizing Instruction

15. Selecting and Developing Materials Activities Appropriate for Individualized Instruction	.67
16. Implementing and Supervising Individualized Instruction	.64
11. Creating Useful Remedial Materials	.56
10. Planning Teaching Activities with Other Teachers or Administrators	.51

Factor 6: Diagnosing Student Needs

4. Identifying Student Attitudes to Better Relate to Problems	.69
3. Identifying Student Disabilities that Need Referral or Special Remedial Work	.69
1. Diagnosing Basic Learning Difficulties	.49
6. Involving Students in Self-Evaluation	.48

TABLE 2

Overall Group Mean Ratings*

	Mean for Items Loading .40 or Above	Average Mean for Each Factor
<u>Factor 1: Pupil Interpersonal Skills and Teacher Self-Improvement</u>		
35. Facilitating Pupil Social Interactions	2.0	
34. Facilitating Self-Confidence and Worth	1.9	
37. Stimulating Growth of Pupil Attitudes and Values	1.8	
31. Developing a Personal Self-Evaluation Method	2.2	
36. Facilitating Development of Pupil Responsibility	2.2	
13. Motivating Students to Learn on Their Own	1.7	
6. Involving Students in Self-Evaluation	2.0	
38. Instilling in the Student the Will to Learn on His/Her Own Initiative	1.7	(1.9)
<u>Factor 2: Implementing Instruction</u>		
18. Utilization of Audio-Visual Equipment and Other Mechanical Aids	2.4	
29. Counselling and Conferring with Students	2.1	
21. Providing for Reinforcements	2.1	
12. Evaluating Instructional Design	2.2	
20. General Presentations of Information and Directions	2.5	
17. Using Questioning Procedures that Promote Discussion	2.0	
25. Knowing Where to Refer Student Problems Beyond What Can be Handled by the Teacher	2.2	(2.2)
<u>Factor 3: Instructional Planning</u>		
9. Selecting and Specifying Performance Goals and Objectives	2.4	
8. Deciding What Teaching Technique is Best for a Particular Outcome	2.0	
5. Establishing Appropriate Performance Standards	2.1	
39. Developing or Modifying Instructional Procedures	2.2	
20. General Presentation of Information and Directions	2.5	
22. Deciding on Appropriate Student Grouping Procedures for Instruction	2.4	(2.3)
<u>Factor 4: Classroom Management Skills</u>		
24. Managing Classroom Affairs in Order to Get Maximum Benefit from Supervising Aids, Tutors, etc.	2.0	
26. Useful Methods of Classroom Discipline & When to Use Them	2.0	
25. Knowing Where to Refer Student Problems Beyond What Can be Handled by the Teacher	2.2	
27. Mainstreaming Classroom Control Without Appearing as an Ogre to Students	2.0	(2.0)

	<u>Mean for Items Loading .40 or Above</u>	<u>Average Mean for Each Factor</u>
<u>Factor 5: Individualizing Instruction</u>		
15. Selecting and Developing Materials Activities Appropriate for Individualized Instruction	1.9	
16. Implementing and Supervising Individualized Instruction	2.0	
11. Creating Useful Remedial Materials	1.8	
10. Planning Teaching Activities with Other Teachers or Administrators	2.1	(1.9)
<u>Factor 6: Diagnosing Student Needs</u>		
4. Identifying Student Attitudes to Better Relate to Problems	1.9	
3. Identifying Student Disabilities that Need Referral or Special Remedial Work	2.0	
1. Diagnosing Basic Learning Difficulties	1.8	
6. Involving Students in Self-Evaluation	2.0	(1.9)

*The lower the mean, the higher the agreement.

Though, overall, the ratings indicate a generally high perceived need in each of the six areas, comparison of the average mean ratings for the items in each of the six factors did not indicate a great deal of variability of response across need areas. Thus useful interpretation of the relative emphases the group as a whole placed on each need area was deemed inappropriate. Therefore, an analysis which attempted to detect if any of the demographic characteristics differentiated individuals with respect to the relative emphases they placed on each need area was performed.

Weighted factor scores for each respondent were computed for each of the six factors. Then, in order to arrive at a determination of which characteristic or set of characteristics best predicted respondent emphasis for each factor, six separate multiple regression analyses were performed with one of the six factors entered as the criterion variable in each regression equation and each of the demographic characteristics entered in stepwise fashion as the predictor variables.

These analyses resulted in two equations with a multiple set of predictors reaching significance and one equation with one predictor approaching significance. Table 3 summarizes the results of those analyses where significance was reached or approached.

As Table 3 indicates, with respect to Factor 2 (Implementing Instruction), the following characteristics (in order of importance) were shown to be related to the emphasis which respondents placed on

Table 3
Summary of Regression Analyses

Criterion Variable	Predictor Variable(s)	Multiple R (Cumulative)	Multiple R ² (Cumulative)	F
Factor 2: Implementing Instruction	Age	.20	.04	4.93*
	Classroom Organization	.24	.06	3.67*
	Years Teaching at SUTC	.28	.08	3.26*
	Level of Educational Attainment	.30	.09	2.89*
	Sex	.32	.10	2.56*
Factor 3: Instructional Planning	Level of Degree	.16	.02	3.13**
Factor 4: Classroom Management Skills	Age	.22	.05	6.27*
	SES	.26	.07	4.38*
	Level of Educational Attainment	.27	.07	3.06*
	Years Teaching at SUTC	.28	.08	2.41*

*significant at .05 level

**approached .05 significance level

Multiple R_c = multiple correlations

Multiple R² = percentage of variance explained

this need area: age, classroom organization, years teaching at SUTC, level of educational attainment, and sex. Level of educational attainment predicted respondents' emphasis on the need area identified by Factor 3 (Instructional Planning), while age, sex, level of educational attainment, and years teaching at SUTC helped predict respondents' emphasis on the need area identified by Factor 4 (Classroom Management Skills). Demographic characteristics did not help predict how teachers responded to the need areas identified by Factor 1, 5, or 6 (Pupil Interpersonal Skills and Teacher Self-Improvement, Individualizing Instruction, and Diagnosing Student Needs).

Discussion

The results of this study tend to indicate that teachers in the Syracuse Urban Teaching Center schools who comprised the sample of this study as a whole perceived those need areas tapped by the Teacher Needs Assessment Survey as being areas of fairly high priority. Additionally, the data suggest that differential teacher response to the needs assessment instrument can be partially predicted from various teacher demographic characteristics.

This study was predicated on the notion that the results derived would primarily provide important evaluative input into the programmatic development activities of the Syracuse Urban Teaching Center; thus a word of caution is in order regarding the generalizability of these results to other teaching centers, schools, and school districts. As no underlying theoretical or conceptual model was used as the basis

for a priori predictions regarding the nature of the expected relationships between the various demographic variables and the self-perceived needs, the relationships observed must be viewed as tentative until further validation is provided. Additionally, the intercorrelations of the demographic variables make interpretation of the results a somewhat difficult and ambiguous venture. Nevertheless, the results do provide some direction for further research.

Two of the six regression equations, each of which employed one of the factored need areas as the criterion variable and the demographic characteristics as the predictor variables, reached the .05 level of statistical significance. One of the other equations approached the .05 criterion of significance, while the remaining two equations were judged non-significant. Due to the limitations regarding the generalizability of these results as mentioned above, it is not possible to interpret the results with a great deal of confidence. However, they do provide the basis for some speculation.

Thirty-two percent of the variance in the need area labelled, Implementation of Instruction, was accounted for by the following teacher demographic characteristics: age, years teaching, educational attainment, sex, and classroom organization. Inspection of the direction of the simple correlational coefficients between the need area and each of the demographic variables revealed more of the nature of the relationships. The older the teacher was, the greater was his/her self-perceived need for Implementation of Instruction skills. The number

of years the teacher had taught was related in the same way (which is not surprising considering the high correlation between these two demographic variables). At first, this finding may appear counter-intuitive since it might be expected that greater age and accumulated years teaching would be associated with increased ability and confidence in this need area. However, inspection of the items which principally load on this need area (use of AV equipment, counseling with students, providing positive reinforcement, evaluation of instructional design, presentation of information and directions, questioning procedures, and problem referrals) suggests the possibility that teachers who were older and had taught for a greater number of years interpreted these items as referring to "contemporary" teaching techniques (or at least contemporary "jargon") with which they did not feel totally familiar. "Educational attainment" had a negative relationship with the need area, Implementation of Instruction; that is, the more schooling the teacher had, the lower his/her self-perceived need for greater facility in this skill area. Males indicated a greater self-perceived need in this area than did females. In addition, teachers who operated in a self-contained classroom reported a greater need for skill development in this area than did teachers working in less structured situations. It might be that teachers in non-self-contained classrooms recognized a greater need for skill in orchestrating their instructional activities in an environment which does not necessarily self-impose order.

The need area, Instructional Planning, was significantly related to one demographic characteristic, educational attainment. Educational attainment accounted for approximately 16% of the variance in this need area. The direction of the relationship was such that the higher the educational attainment level of the teacher, the less that teacher agreed that skill development in this area was an important personal need. This relationship is consistent with the relationship discussed before between educational attainment and the need area, Implementation of Instruction. It is unclear why the relationship between age and years teaching, detected with respect to this latter need area, was not also found with respect to Instructional Planning.

Though the relationship between the need area, Classroom Management Skills, and a number of demographic characteristics only approached statistical significance, it is briefly discussed here since the relatively small sample size of this study may not have provided the statistical power appropriate for detecting a significant relationship. Age and years teaching were related in a similar way as they were related to the first need area discussed, Implementation of Instruction. The responses of older teachers and teachers with more experience teaching tended to be associated with a greater emphasis on this need area than did the responses of younger and less experienced teachers. It might be that the changing climate of the classroom and the associated "breakdown" of previous social constraints on student behavior have created a perceived need among older, more experienced

teachers to acquire new classroom management techniques. Females indicated a greater need for skill development in this area than did males. Educational attainment was associated with self-reported need in this area in that the more schooling the teacher had, the more emphasis he/she placed on skill development in Classroom Management. This relationship is somewhat difficult to interpret, but it might be due to the fact that traditional teacher training programs have not fully addressed the needs of teachers in this area.

A few comments regarding the limitations of the use of the Teacher Needs Assessment Survey in its present form appear to be in order. The lack of substantial differences among the emphases placed on each of the identified need areas, however, prevents an estimation of the degree to which the data obtained are confounded by systematic response biases. In addition, it might be that teacher responses were influenced by social desirability. It is suggested that in future research and use, this instrument be reformatted such that individual items alternately provide both positive and negative connotations. The items in the present form of the instrument are worded such that each item refers to an activity or need which all teachers might be expected to agree is a "good thing" for teachers. It is difficult, therefore, to "tease out" (or even to guess) how much of the teachers' responses are based on estimations of their own personal needs or those of teachers in general.

A further limitation of the use of this instrument in attempts to assess teacher perceived needs is that it is impossible to determine whether the perceived needs tapped are an exhaustive list of those needs which are actually relevant to the particular group of teachers with which the instrument is being used. While the need areas apparently tapped by this instrument may be appropriate and fairly exhaustive for one group of teachers, the peculiarities of the geographic or social environment in which another group of teachers operate might mitigate the validity, or at least the appropriateness, of these need areas for this latter group. Further research which attempts to determine the degree to which these need areas are perceived as relevant and exhaustive to particular subgroups of teachers appears warranted.

Implications

The decision to undertake this study was made for a variety of reasons. A summative evaluation of the Syracuse Urban Teaching Center (SUTC) showed that there was a need to address specific skill areas in the inservice training program. Informal communication with teachers in SUTC schools supported this claim. Further, it became evident that a systematic means for information gathering might be the most efficient way to identify needs and enhance planning activities.

For these reasons, the staff decided to adopt the Teacher Needs Assessment Survey and to gather demographic information under the auspices of in-house research. Because of the planning purposes of this study, this model of in-house research is more closely linked to

and more properly received as an evaluation method, rather than encompassing the specific claims of research methodology. Accounting for this limitation, it is the opinion of the authors of this report that the worth of this study lies in its usefulness to collect data which is open to preliminary analysis for planning and projection within the confines of this population. This objective for using the research model has allowed us to determine our needs, plan accordingly and further has provided us with a systematic means for data collection and reduction. Most importantly, this in-house research model has enabled the project staff to plan inservice activities under the recommendations and guidelines of these survey results.

Footnotes

- ¹Kenneth Howey, "Putting Inservice Teacher Education into Perspective," Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976), 105.
- ²Louis J. Rubin, "Teacher Growth in Perspective," in Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures, edited by Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 245.
- ³Morris L. Cogan, "Current Issues in Education of Teachers," in Teacher Education: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, edited by Kevin Ryan (Chicago: NSSE, 1975), p. 220, quoted in ISTE Report III, The Literature on Teacher Inservice Education.
- ⁴Research Division, National Education Association, Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-SI (Washington: National Education Association, 1966), p. 3.
- ⁵Roy A. Edelfelt and Margo Johnson (eds.), Rethinking In-Service Education (Washington: National Education Association, 1975), p. 5.
- ⁶Edelfelt, Rethinking In-Service Education, p. 32-33.
- ⁷Robert N. Bush, "Curriculum-Proof Teachers: Who Does What to Whom," in Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 14.
- ⁸John Mangieni and David McWilliams, "Designing Effective Inservice Programs," Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976): p. 25.
- ⁹Elizabeth A. Dillon, "Staff Development, Whose Job Is It?" Educational Leadership (November 1974), p. 139.
- ¹⁰Ibid., p. 140.
- ¹¹Robert B. Howsam, "Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium," in Governance by Consortium, edited by John H. Hansen (National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers, 1974), p. 16.
- ¹²Lillian V. Cady, "Governance by Consortium or Who's in Charge Here?" in Governance by Consortium, edited by John H. Hansen (National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Centers, 1974), p. 26.
- ¹³Bill Drummond and Anna Nuernberger, "The Florida Collaboration Model Project (A Very Strong Bind)," Proceedings of the National Conference on Collaboration, Gainesville, Florida, 1974, p. 3.
- ¹⁴Ibid., p. 5.

- ¹⁵Bruce R. Joyce, "Structural Imagination and Professional Staff Development," paper presented at the National Council of States on Inservice Education, New Orleans, 17-19, November 1976.
- ¹⁶Kenneth Howey, "Putting Inservice Teacher Education Into Perspective," Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976): 101-105.
- ¹⁷Ibid., p. 105.
- ¹⁸Research Division, National Education Association, "Inservice Education of Teachers; Research Summary 1966-S1." ERIC ED022:728: 1966.
- ¹⁹Dorothy Westby-Gibson, "Inservice Education--Perspectives for Educators." ERIC ED015 161: 1967.
- ²⁰Gordon Lawrence, Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art, Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education, Florida Department of Education, [1974], pp. 1-31.
- ²¹Donald R. Cruickshank, John J. Kennedy and Betty Myers, "Perceived Problems of Secondary School Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, 68 (December 1974): 156.
- ²²Gary M. Ingersoll, "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Teacher Responses," Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976), 169-73.
- ²³Ibid.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bush, Robert N. "Curriculum-Proof Teachers: Who Does What To Whom," in Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, pp. 37-68. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Cady, Lillian V. "Governance by Consortium or Who's in Charge Here?" In Governance by Consortium, pp. 26-34. Edited by John H. Hansen. National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Center, 1974.
- Cogan, Morris L. "Current Issues in Education of Teachers, in Teacher Education: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, edited by Kevin Ryan. Chicago: NSSE, 1975, quoted in ISTE Report III, The Literature on Teacher Inservice Education.
- Cruickshank, Donald R., John J. Kennedy and Betty Myers. "Perceived Problems of Secondary School Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, 68 (December 1974): 154-159.
- Dillon, Elizabeth A. "Staff Development, Whose Job Is It?" Educational Leadership (November 1974): pp. 137-140.
- Drummond, William, and Anna Nuernberger. "The Florida Collaboration Model Project (A Very Strange Bird)." Proceedings of the National Conference on Collaboration. Gainesville, Florida, 1974.
- Edelfelt, Roy A. and Margo Johnson, ed. Rethinking In-Service Education. Washington: National Education Association, 1975.
- Howey, Kenneth R. "Putting Inservice Education Into Perspective." Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976): 101-105.
- Howsam, Robert B. "Governance of Teacher Education by Consortium." In Governance by Consortium, pp. 9-25 Edited by John H. Hansen. National Consortium of Competency-Based Education Center, 1974.
- Ingersoll, Gary M. "Assessing Inservice Training Needs through Teacher Responses." Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976), 169-73.
- Joyce, Bruce R. "Structural Imagination and Professional Staff Development." Paper presented at the National Council of States on Inservice Education, New Orleans, 17-19, November 1976.
- Lawrence, Gordon. Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education. Florida Department of Education, [1977].

Mangieni, John and David McWilliams. "Designing Effective Inservice Programs." Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (Summer 1976): 110-112.

Research Division, National Education Association. "Inservice Education Association; Research Summary 1966-51." ERIC ED022:728 : 1966.

Westby-Gibson, Dorothy, "Inservice Education--Perspectives for Educators." ERIC ED015:161 : 1967.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
22. Deciding on appropriate pupil grouping procedures for instruction.	—	—	—	—	—
23. Constructively using evaluation in helping students progress.	—	—	—	—	—
24. Managing classroom affairs in order to get maximum benefit from supervising, aids, tutors, etc.	—	—	—	—	—
25. Knowing where to refer student problems beyond what can be handled by the teacher.	—	—	—	—	—
26. Useful methods of classroom discipline and when to use them.	—	—	—	—	—
27. Maintaining classroom control without appearing as an ogre to the students.	—	—	—	—	—
28. Communicating and interacting with parents.	—	—	—	—	—
29. Counselling and conferring with students.	—	—	—	—	—
30. Involving others in the school program.	—	—	—	—	—
31. Developing a personal self-evaluation method.	—	—	—	—	—
32. Developing a broad acceptance of self.	—	—	—	—	—
33. Developing a capacity of accepting others' feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
34. Facilitating pupil self-concept and worth.	—	—	—	—	—
35. Facilitating pupil social interaction.	—	—	—	—	—
36. Facilitating development of pupil responsibility.	—	—	—	—	—
37. Stimulating growth of pupil attitudes and values.	—	—	—	—	—
38. Instilling in the student the will to learn on her/his own initiative.	—	—	—	—	—
39. Developing or modifying instructional procedures to suit your own strengths.	—	—	—	—	—
40. Identifying the gifted and talented students.	—	—	—	—	—

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

TEACHER NEEDS ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

THERE IS A NEED FOR SKILL TRAINING IN:

1. Diagnosing basic learning difficulties.
2. Constructing and using tests for evaluating academic progress.
3. Identifying student disabilities that need referral or special remedial work.
4. Identifying student attitudes to better relate to problems.
5. Establishing appropriate performance standards.
6. Involving students in self-evaluation.
7. Teacher-pupil verbal interaction.
8. Deciding what teaching technique is best for a particular intended outcome.
9. Selecting and specifying performance goals and objectives.
10. Planning teaching activities with other teachers or administrators.
11. Creating useful remedial materials.
12. Evaluating instruction/instructional design.
13. Motivating students to learn on their own.
14. Keeping abreast of developments in your own subject matter area.
15. Selecting and developing materials activities appropriate for individualized instruction.
16. Implementing and supervising individualized instruction.
17. Using questioning procedures that promote discussion.
18. Utilization of audiovisual equipment and other mechanical aids.
19. Gearing instruction to problem solving.
20. General presentation of information and directions.
21. Providing for reinforcement.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Undecided
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---

continued--